

II. General Remarks Concerning This Response

Claims 1-28 are currently pending. In this response, claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20-28 have been amended; no claims have been added; and no claims have been canceled. Reconsideration of the claims is requested.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)–Anticipation–Rochford et al.

The Office action has rejected claims 1, 2, 10-12, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Rochford et al., "Method and Apparatus for Selecting Network Entities", U.S. Patent Number 6,633,312, filed 10/19/1999, issued on 10/14/2003. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to include at least one feature that is not disclosed in Rochford et al.. The present invention is directed to a network management framework that enables endpoints within a distributed data processing system to be flexibly managed with respect to geographic locations. In addition, the present invention provides functionality for managing the distributed data processing system in accordance with geographic boundaries. Moreover, the present invention determines whether a principal, such as an administrative user, is authorized to access resources on a geographic boundary or within a geographic boundary. These features are more fully reflected in the claims. With respect to the independent claims, each independent claim now includes a router-based focus for determining a "geographic router boundary resource". For example, independent claim 1, as amended, specifically recites:

determining a set of router systems that are closest to a geographic boundary such that each router system in the set of router systems is geographically located on or within a given geographic boundary; and

generating a geographic router boundary resource for the set of router systems such that the geographic router boundary resource defines a logical boundary within the distributed data processing system based on the geographic location information for each router system in the set of router systems.

Rochford et al. does not disclose any similar nor equivalent process for determining geographic router boundary resources.

Hence, Rochford et al. clearly does not disclose features as required by the language of the amended claims of the present application. As stated at MPEP § 2131: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Hence, for this and other reasons, Rochford et al. cannot be used as an anticipatory reference, and the rejections of the claims have been overcome, whereby Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejections.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Obviousness—Rochford in view of Taghadoss

The Office action has rejected claims 3, 13, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Rochford et al. in view of Taghadoss, "System and Method for Managing Network Resources Using Distributed Intelligence and State Management", U.S. Patent No. 6,052,722, filed 03/07/1997, issued 04/18/2000. This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot based on the amendment to dependent claim 3 to include the features of dependent claim 4.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Obviousness—Rochford in view of Thebaut

The Office action has rejected claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Rochford et al. in view of Thebaut et al., "Policy Management and Conflict Resolution in Computer Networks", U.S. Patent No. 6,381,639, filed 12/22/1998, issued 04/30/2002. This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot based on the amendment to dependent claim 4 to include the features of dependent claim 3.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Obviousness—Rochford in view of Lewis

The Office action has rejected claims 6-8, 16-18, and 26-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Rochford et al. in view of Lewis, "Method and Apparatus for Inter-Domain Alarm Correlation", U.S. Patent No. 6,430,712, filed 12/06/1999, issued 08/06/2002. This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot based on the amendments to claims 6-8, 16-18, and 26-28 to include the features of dependent claims 3 and 4.

VII. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Obviousness—Rochford in view of Cromer

The Office action has rejected claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Rochford et al. in view of Cromer et al., "Data Processing System and Method for Determining a Physical Location of a Client Computer System", U.S. Patent No. 6,397,249, filed 11/24/1998, issued 05/28/2002. This rejection is respectfully traversed. This rejection is moot based on the amendments to independent claims 1 and 11.


VIII. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the present application is patentable, and Applicant kindly requests a Notice of Allowance.

For any other outstanding matters or issues, the examiner is urged to call or fax the below-listed telephone numbers to expedite the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: February 17, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph R. Burwell
Reg. No. 44,468
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

Law Office of Joseph R. Burwell
P.O. Box 28022
Austin, Texas 78755
Voice: 866-728-3688 (866-PATENT8)
Fax: 866-728-3680 (866-PATENT0)
Email: joe@burwell.biz